

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Adam Walsh	Team: Team # 4	CCRB Case #: 201205103	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 04/19/2012 4:15 PM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 01	18 Mo. SOL 10/19/2013	EO SOL 10/19/2013	
Date/Time CV Reported Mon, 04/23/2012 9:42 AM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 04/23/2012 9:42 AM		
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address			
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command		
1. POM Juan Perez	11514	942340	006 PCT		
Officer(s)	Allegation			Investigator Recommendation	
A.POM Juan Perez	Discourtesy: PO Juan Perez spoke rudely to § 87(2)(b)				

Case Summary

On April 23, 2012, § 87(2)(b) filed her complaint on behalf of § 87(2)(b) with the CCRB via telephone.

On April 19, 2012, at approximately 4:15 p.m., § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were at § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan. The office had just closed at 4:00 p.m. A police officer in uniform, identified by § 87(2)(b) by his name and shield #11514 as PO Juan Perez, was outside the front door. PO Perez banged on the door, and asked § 87(2)(b) who works as § 87(2)(b), to let him in as a courtesy. § 87(2)(b) told PO Perez that she could not let him in, as the DMV had closed for the day. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b), but did not interject as they supported § 87(2)(b)'s decision. PO Perez then yelled at § 87(2)(b) "What are you, stupid? Are you retarded?" (**Allegation A**) and made his fingers and hand into the shape of a gun, and put it to his head. § 87(2)(b) then walked over to PO Perez and asked him if she could help him. PO Perez did not tell her why he was at the DMV. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Perez for his name and shield number and PO Perez provided his name, and shield number to § 87(2)(b).

Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) provided the CCRB with an official statement. Although a physical description of PO Perez was not provided, during the incident § 87(2)(b) asked PO Perez for his name and shield, and he provided his name and shield #11514. A search of CTS shows that shield number 11514 is assigned to PO Juan Perez, of the 6th Precinct. Furthermore, the Roll Call from April 19, 2012, indicates that PO Perez was on-duty and assigned to a foot patrol. § 87(2)(g)

Between April 24, 2012, and May 3, 2012, the undersigned investigator placed two phone calls to both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) and mailed each a please call letter. On May 3, 2012, the undersigned investigator obtained phone statements from both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). During her phone statement, § 87(2)(b) indicated that she had filed her complaint on behalf of § 87(2)(b) and wished to proceed with the complaint in whichever manner § 87(2)(b) desired. § 87(2)(b) indicated that she wished to pursue an investigation, and tentatively scheduled a time for an interview at the CCRB for May 7, 2012. On May 4, 2012, the undersigned investigator confirmed the interview time and date with § 87(2)(b) via telephone. On May 7, 2012, § 87(2)(b) missed her scheduled appointment, and did not call in advance to cancel or reschedule. On May 8, 2012, a phone call was placed to § 87(2)(b). She indicated that she had experienced a death in the family, and the undersigned investigator made plans to contact § 87(2)(b) on May 21, 2012. A missed appointment letter was not sent because the undersigned investigator made contact with § 87(2)(b) during that call. On May 21, 2012, the undersigned investigator called and left a message for § 87(2)(b). On May 22, 2012, the undersigned called and left a message for § 87(2)(b). On June 20, 2012, a call was made to § 87(2)(b) but § 87(2)(b) indicated that she was busy, and would call back. On June 28, 2012, the undersigned investigator called § 87(2)(b) and made contact with an unidentified male, who said he could take a message for § 87(2)(b) and the undersigned investigator left a message. On the same day a call was placed to § 87(2)(b) and a voicemail message was left indicating that the undersigned investigator was having trouble reaching § 87(2)(b) and asking § 87(2)(b) to speak with § 87(2)(b) to see how she wanted to pursue her complaint. On July 19, 2012, calls were placed to both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). A voicemail message could not be left for § 87(2)(b). The undersigned investigator left a voicemail message for § 87(2)(b) indicating that if she did not contact the undersigned investigator, her complaint could be closed without a full investigation. Final please call letters were also mailed to both parties on that day. Those letters were not returned by the United States Postal Service. A search of NYS and NYC Corrections records on

August 27, 2012 indicated that neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) are incarcerated. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) provided the CCRB with an official statement. § 87(2)(g)

Team: _____

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date

Supervisor:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date